DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 316 SP 010 973

AUTHOR Sagness, Richard; And Others
TITLE A Study to Validate Undergraduate Teacher Education Competencies at the University of South Dakota.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 23p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Analysis of Variance; Cooperating Teachers; *Curriculum Development; Data Analysis; *Educational Objectives; Field Experience Programs; Fundamental Concepts; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Program Evaluation; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; Teacher Educators; Teacher Interns; *Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS University of South Dakota

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to determine those competencies considered most important by cooperating teachers, student interns, and school of education faculty. Competencies from various sources were combined to form a master list of sixty-five competencies. One-hundred participants were given numbered cards with a competency printed on each. Their task was to rank the importance of each competency in the preparation of teachers on a continuum from "most" to "least." There were seven ranks in the continuum, and a further condition forced the respondent to put at least nine competencies in each rank. This stipulation was included to prevent large numbers of competencies from being given the same rank. Responses of each group of participants were analyzed, and some significant differences were discovered. It appeared from the results that student interns and faculty shared a similar philosophy, which seems to be student-oriented and humanistic in nature, while the responses of the cooperating teachers seem to reflect a concern with classroom management. It is hoped that the data acquired from this study will help guide and implement the future planning of competency based teacher education programs. (JD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED137316

1526

A STUDY TO VALIDATE UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER EDUCATION COMPETENCIES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA

by

Richard Sagness

Arlen Gullickson

Marilyn Hadley

Jerry Horn

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP010 973

INTRODUCTION

Changes in teacher education programs have been called for in order to make the programs more pertinent to the needs of developing professional educators. There are no magic or immediate solutions to this problem of relevant teacher education, but changes must be more than cosmetic in nature. Walter Busby called for a reexamination of the problem in the light of our changing concepts of behavior and learning. (1)

The need for new structures coupled with the ferment of criticism and experimentation has led to long needed innovations in teacher education programs. One of the alternatives which has resulted is the structuring of programs around competencies. The philosophy of competency-based teacher education (CBTE) programs rests on the premise that successful teaching behaviors can be identified and a program to facilitate the development of these bahaviors can be constructed.

The School of Education at the University of South Dakota (USD) has converted to a competency-based and field-centered teacher education program in the last four years. This dual approach (competency-based and field-based) is facilitated by modular instruction and is designed to prepare prospective teachers in a way which transcends and blends on-and-off campus experiences. Instead of continuing separate classes on the theoretical aspects of teaching until the prospective teacher enters student teaching, this dual approach is committed to assessing the effectiveness of the prospective teacher on the basis of prescribed levels of performance derived from the integration of theoretical and applied knowledge in both on and off campus experiences. This approach reinforces interaction and collaboration between the the University and the local

school districts as well as strengthens peer relationships among participants. (2)

At the University of South Dakota, competency based education is based upon the specification of and agreement on performance goals in rigorous detail in advance of instruction. Competencies include skills, behaviors, and knowledge. The student preparing to become a teacher must either be able to demonstrate his ability to promote desirable learning or exhibit behaviors known to promote it. He is held accountable, not for passing grades, but for attaining a given level of competency in performing the essential tasks of teaching; the training institution is itself held accountable for producing able teachers. The emphasis is on demonstrated product or output. (3)

An examination of the literature shows that most publications and research in competency-based teacher education have dealt with some aspect of planning or implementing a CBTE program. However, there is a dearth of research in the area of validation of specific competencies. A library search for the period 1970 to 1975 revealed no research in this area. This writer is aware of a current study being jointly conducted by the University of Tennessee and Carson-Newman College. For this study, input in compiling and evaluating a list of competencies is being sought from institutions throughout the nation. While the purpose of the Tennessee study is similar to the study at South Dakota, the scope is national rather than local.

Energies at USD during the past four years and more have been directed toward planning and implementing the CBTE program. However, no action research in terms of competency identification and ranking as a part of the on-going evaluation of the program had been undertaken. It was and is felt

that continuing lines of action research in relationship to the development of the program should be undertaken. This study is one of several lines of CBTE research that are currently going on in the School of Education.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In an attempt to assess opinions from various groups involved in the University of South Dakota's teacher education program and to gather information to aid future CBTE curriculum developments, a study was conducted in the spring of 1975 to determine those competencies considered most important by cooperating teachers, student interns, and School of Education faculty. It was felt that information was needed in order to improve the CBTE program in general and the field experiences of student interns specifically.

One problem identified was the assignment of priorities to competencies related to field experiences of student interns. Field experiences include student teaching, seminars, workshops, and modules which occur on campus and/or at the field center. Data collected in relationship to this problem can be used for curriculum development and revision of field center activities.

A second problem established was the identification of response differences among groups. Data collected for this purpose can indicate differences in perceptions between students, practicing public school teachers, and university faculty which may have important implications for a collaborative model. Awareness of differences can lead to efforts for increased communication among groups, to development of in-service programs, and/or to curriculum revision.

PROCEDURE

In designing the study, the Q-Sort technique (4) was selected as the statistical procedure to produce a rank-order of competencies. Using this method, an individual is asked to sort a large number (usually sixty to ninety) of cards into sets or piles according to some criterion. The objects in each pile are assigned a value which is used for statistical purposes.

In this case, the objects were cards with a single competency typed on each. The respondent was asked to sort the competencies on a "most important"-"least important" continuum. Cards in the pile on the "most important" end of the continuum were assigned a value of "1" and cards in the pile on the "least important" end of the continuum were assigned a value of "7".

Competencies from various sources were combined to form a master list of sixty-five competencies. One source was the University of South Dakota's School of Education Ad Hoc Committee on Competencies which reviewed the competencies of many programs nation-wide before identifying a detailed structure of competencies for USD. A second source was the Secondary Education 400 course (series of modules) which serves as a basic required course for all secondary student interns and is competency-based. Competencies identified by various teams and faculty members were also used as sources. These competencies were organized into the nine categories which had been adopted by the Ad Hoc Committee cited previously. A list of these categories and the competencies which fit into each is in Table 1. This master list was submitted for review to ten faculty members who deleted from, added to, or otherwise changed the list. The data from the

participating faculty members were synthesized to eliminate repetitious material and to reduce an original list of one hundred thirty-five competencies to sixty-five.

(Insert Table 1)

A sample of one hundred participants was drawn representing 30% of the student intern, cooperating teacher, and School of Education faculty populations. Forty-two interns and forty cooperating teachers were randomly selected from nine field-center school districts whose student enrollments ranged from 432 to 17,142. These nine field center school districts were in southeastern South Dakota communities within a 180 mile range of USD. Eighteen School of Education faculty members were randomly selected.

The School of Education has an interdisciplinary team structure rather than departmental. Five of the ten teams in the school are associated with field center schools and have current lists of personnel associated with that team. Names of respondents were drawn by selecting every third name from these lists. Table 2 shows the number of participants in each group and the response rate for each group.

(Insert Table 2)

The study was conducted during the last two weeks of April 1975 after the students interns had been in the field center schools three months. The cooperation of team leaders was enlisted in distributing and collecting the packets from faculty and field center coordinators. Three weeks time was allowed for the distribution, completion, and collection of the data.

Each participant was given a packet which included a cover letter,

directions, and sixty-five numbered cards with a competency printed on each. Their task, which was estimated to take twenty to thirty minutes, was to rank the importance of each competency in the preparation of teachers on a continuum from "most" to "least". There were seven ranks in the continuum and a further condition forced the respondent to put at least nine competencies in each rank. This stipulation was included to prevent large numbers of competencies from being given the same rank.

Seventy-six of the one hundred packets were returned, of which five were invalid because the directions for forced ranking were not followed. The response rate was 69% for student interns, 72.5% for cooperating teachers, and 95% for School of Education faculty.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

TOTAL GROUP RANKING OF COMPETENCIES

Using a scale of "1" to "7" with 1 being high, the rankings for each competency by the seventy-one respondents were averaged to produce a mean score for each competency. This mean score was then used to list the competencies in order of importance. Table 3 is a listing of the sixty-five competencies in rank order. The category for each competency is also included. The top six ranked competencies are student-oriented in nature. Breaking these six competencies down by category, it can be seen that there is one in each of the Planning, Skills, Management, and Communication and Cooperation categories and two competencies in the Procedure category.

(Insert Table 3)

There is a drop of .6700 in mean scores between the third and fourth

ranked competencies, separating the three top-ranked competencies from the rest of the list. The standard deviation for each of the top three scores is relatively small, indicating a smaller degree of variance in answers among respondents on these items than on most competencies. These two factors lend further support to the strength of the rankings for these three items.

At the other end of the continuum there is a similar separation of the last six competencies from the majority of competencies, also accompanied by relatively low standard deviations for each. This clumping together would also strongly indicate that these were definitely considered least important in relation to the other competencies. A competency which is ranked low is not considered unimportant or unnecessary, but the need for review is not immediate. Three of the lowest ranked items are in the Legal category. The other three competencies are from the Theoretical, Evaluation, and Classroom Management categories.

Table 4 shows how the competencies in each category are ranked. Of the competencies that fit in the 1st to 10th rankings, three were in the Procedures category while two were in both the Skills and the Self-Development categories. The Planning as well as the Communication and Cooperation categories were well represented in the number of competencies from each that were considered among the twenty most important competencies. There were no competencies in the top ten rankings from the Theoretical, Evaluation, or Legal categories. Three of the five Legal competencies were among the four lowest ranked items.

(Insert Table 4)

In general, competencies in the Evaluation and Legal categories tend to be ranked lower than competencies in other categories while competencies in the Planning, Communication and Cooperation and Self-Development categories tend to be ranked higher than competencies in other categories.

DIFFERENCES AMONG GROUPS

An analysis of variance test with $\alpha = .05$ level was used in determining significance. In twelve of the sixty-five competencies, differences between student interns, cooperating teachers, and education school faculty were significant at the .05 level. These competencies and their respective significance levels and ranking are identified in Table 5.

(Insert Table 5)

Statistically significant differences among respondent groups were found in three of the five top-ranked competencies (#28, 38, and 17), as well as in one of the lowest-ranked competencies (#61). While differences among respondent groups in each of the twelve competencies are important to examine for future decisions, these four would be strong starting points.

Of the twelve competencies showing significant differences among the participating groups, three were from each of the Planning and Classroom Management categories and two from the Procedures category. No competencies in the Theoretical and Legal categories showed significant differences among groups. The remaining categories were each represented by one significant competency.

The Scheffé (5) test was used to make pair-wise contrasts, between possible pairs for each of the twelve competencies. For this test, the cooperating teachers were broken into two groups, elementary and secondary.

Therefore, the testing was done for four rather than three groups of the twelve competencies compared by this test. Only seven showed pair-wise significance between groups. Results of the pair-wise contrasts are given in Table 6.

(Insert Table 6)

In interpreting this data it was decided to examine responses of student interns as compared with elementary and secondary cooperating teachers and the School of Education faculty as a starting point.

It was found that student intern responses were significantly different from the responses of other groups in the cases of #27, 28, and 54. In all of these cases the student interns differed from one or the other of the cooperating teacher groups, but did not differ significantly from the School of Education faculty. In examining the School of Education faculty as a group, it was found that they differed from the elementary or secondary cooperating teacher groups on competencies #28, 36, 38, 40, and 54. Both the interns and the School of Education faculty differed from the secondary teachers on competency #28 which deals with the teacher demonstrating sensitivity to student feelings. Interns and faculty also differed significantly from elementary teachers on competency #54 which describes the role of the teacher in discussions as a facilitator. It was found that the responses of student interns, elementary and secondary cooperating teachers and School of Education faculty to competencies #8, 9, 11, 39, and 65 were not significantly different in pair-wise contrasts.

Average ratings of two or three groups were found to be significantly different from the average rating of the remaining group(s) for each of

these competencies. In Table 7 it can be seen that in the case of competencies #8 and 9, the interns differed significantly from the average ratings of the three other groups. For competencies #27, 28, 38, and 54 the average ratings of interns and faculty members were significantly different than the average rating of elementary and secondary cooperating teachers. Only for competencies #11 and #39 could the ratings of interns be averaged with elementary or secondary cooperating teachers, respectively, to show a significant difference from the average rating of the faculty and the remaining cooperating teacher group.

(Insert Table 7)

It appears that the interns and faculty share a similar philosophy which seems to be student-oriented and humanistic in nature, while the responses of the cooperating teachers seem to reflect a concern with classroom management. For the seven competencies in Table 6, there were sixty possibilities for pair-wise contrasts. Interns did not differ from faculty once while they disagreed with elementary cooperating teachers in three instances and with secondary cooperating teachers twice. For the five competencies listed in Table 7, where a total of eighty-six contrasts were made, interns agreed with School of Education faculty five times, with elementary teachers twice, and with secondary cooperating teachers once.

RECOMMENDATIONS

One of the purposes of the study was to assign priorities to sixty-five selected competencies to provide direction in planning for future curriculum development. There are several ways in which the

resulting data, found in Table 3, can be used. First, the question must be asked "Are these sixty-five competencies now provided for in the preparation of teachers?" If not, steps should be taken to include those which are missing. Second, a close examination of the present practices in preparing student interns to meet at least the twenty most important competencies should be conducted. The question to be asked at this point is "Are student interns competent in this area at the termination of their work?" Answers to this question may result in curriculum revision in order to improve the intended student performance outcomes.

A third way in which this data could be used is to make the results of the ranking known to the School of Education faculty as well as to the incoming interns and participating cooperating teachers. Awareness of these rankings could create a meaningful basis for discussion, individualization and evaluation of the program of each intern.

The second purpose of the study was to identify what differences, if any, exist among the attitudes of student interns, elementary and secondary cooperating teachers, and Education School faculty. Where differences exist, it appears that it is the philosophies of the faculty and students that differ from the philosophies of the cooperating teachers. Do these differences influence the implementation of the CBTE program? With only twelve of sixty-five competencies showing differences among groups, it is difficult to come to any conclusions. It appears, however, that the interns and faculty share a similar philosophy which seems to be student-oriented and humanistic in nature, while the responses of the cooperating teachers seem to reflect a concern with classroom management.

Further research should be conducted in this area in order to provide more data on the extent of differences. Workshops, seminars, or other

situations could be used to make members of these groups aware of these differences and to encourage communication about these differences in order to determine obstacles to the success of the CBTE program.

A comparison of results between the Tennessee study mentioned earlier or studies which may be occurring at other institutions and the results of this study could raise interesting questions. An awareness of these differences, if any, might be the seed for future growth in the CBTE program at the University of South Dakota.

NOTES

1 Busby, Walter A., Combs, Arthur W., Blums, Robert, Avila, Donald and Oberlin, Lyn "Can Teacher Education Use the 'Self as Instrument' Concept?" Educational Leadership, (March, 1974), p. 516.

2 Sagness, Richard L. and Stouffer, Ralph E. "Teacher Education Model for the School of Education at The University of South Dakota," (A Working Paper, 1972), p. 2.

3 Ibid, p. 4.

4 Glass, Gene V and Stanley, Julian C. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970), p. 388.

5 Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965), p. 581.

TABLE 1

CATEGORIES OF COMPETENCIES

	CATEGORY	COMPETENCY NUMBER
I	Theoretical	1 - 5
II	Planning	6 - 15
III	Skills	16 - 22
IV	Procedures	23 - 29
V	Evaluation	30 - 36
VI	Classroom Management	37 - 45
VII	Legal	46 - 50
VIII	Communication and Cooperation	51 - 59
IX	Self-Development	60 - 65

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS AND RESPONSE RATE

GROUP	N	RESPONSE RATE N	%
Interns	42	27	69
Cooperating Teachers	40	27	72.5
Faculty	18	17	95
TOTAL	100	71	71

TABLE 3

LISTING OF COMPETENCIES
BY RANKING

Ranking	Competency Number	Description of Competency	Category	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	55	Treat each student with dignity and respect.	VIII	1.6000	1.1966
2	14	Create opportunities for every student to experience success.	II	1.7163	1.3436
3	28	Demonstrate sensitivity to the feelings and concerns of students.	IV	1.8732	1.2865
4	4	Discriminate among performance objectives, general objectives, and goals.	I	4.4648	1.8034
4	38	Identify discipline problems and suggest methods of reducing or avoiding these discipline problems.	VI	2.5493	1.7064
5	17	Provide verbal and non-verbal reinforcement for appropriate student response in a variety of ways.	III	2.6338	1.4759
6	29	Provide for a variety of student activities in a lesson.	IV	2.7324	1.5488
7	61	Accept responsibility for his/her decisions and actions, especially as related to his/her personal development.	IX	2.9155	1.7134
8	63	Maintain a regular and prompt schedule of attendance.	IX	2.9286	1.7555
9	27	Accept values different from his/her own without value judgment.	IV	2.9859	1.9530
10	16	Establish set by providing information, directions, structure, or motivation at the beginning of the lesson.	III	3.0000	1.6330
11	12	Design and implement individualized learning materials and activities.	II	3.0704	1.8073
12	64	Plan for self-improvement of characteristics and behaviors selected for improvement.	IX	3.1831	1.9359
13	42	Develop democratic classroom rules and procedures which promote opportunities for independent choice and activity by students.	VI	3.2113	1.8510
14.5	9	Write a lesson plan which includes performance objectives, lesson introduction, lesson conclusions, activities, time sequence, materials, and evaluation.	II	3.2254	1.9361
14.5	10	Plan and integrate a unit, which includes unit goals, general and performance objectives, activities and evaluation, into a course being taught.	II	3.2254	1.8063
16	52	Work cooperatively with other staff members in team teaching and developmental projects.	VIII	3.2535	1.6451
17	60	Accept the characteristics and behaviors of others with whom he/she interacts professionally.	IX	3.2899	1.9028
18	3	Demonstrate an understanding of child and/or adolescent psychology, whichever is appropriate.	I	3.3239	1.7548
19	59	Conduct group activities in which students learn and use techniques of giving and receiving helpful feedback.	VIII	3.3803	1.6593
20	54	Demonstrate the ability to serve as a facilitator or catalyst to promote student discussion and peer communication.	VIII	3.3944	1.8243
21	21	Vary the stimulus or pattern of lesson presentations by switching to different interaction styles.	III	3.4225	1.7043
22	35	Provide students with the proper data and opportunities so that students can evaluate their own progress toward the established objectives.	V	3.4366	1.7049
23	37	Maintain consistency in standards and consequences.	VI	3.5634	1.9693
24	1	Identify and use the following modes of teaching: lecture, demonstration, recitation, teaching machines, computer assistance, questioning, directions, mastery-drill, problem-solving, clarification, dialogue, grouping.	I	3.5714	2.1641

TABLE 3 (Cont.)

Ranking	Competency Number	Description of Competency	Category	Mean	Standard Deviation
25	53	Conduct parent conferences to aid in the progress of the student without destroying confidence and trust.	VIII	3.6087	1.7168
26	40	Provide alternative solutions to problems so that the consequence fits the misbehavior and neither teacher nor student lose face.	VI	3.6479	1.8213
27	51	Work cooperatively with other staff members in departments, curriculum, faculty and professional committees and meetings.	VIII	3.6857	1.8379
28.5	13	Select concepts and skills in terms of student and societal needs.	II	3.6901	1.8743
28.5	11	Pre-assess students for prerequisite skills or abilities necessary for the achievement or performance objectives.	II	3.6901	1.9093
30	47	Conduct classes with maximum concern for the well-being of students and minimum chance of incurring liability on himself/herself.	VII	3.7324	2.0210
31	8	Specify goals and aims for a unit and course that fit within the framework of the goals of the schools.	II	3.7465	1.8025
32	19	Use recall, information-gathering, information-processing and conclusion-forming questions.	III	3.8169	1.7013
33.5	18	Demonstrate closure by summarizing a lesson as well as developing relationships between previously known, currently presented, and future learning.	III	3.8451	1.8178
33.5	22	Cue, or prompt, students in answering a question or in making a worthwhile contribution to the class.	III	3.8451	1.9394
35	43	Maintain accurate student records and reports.	VI	3.8592	1.8845
36	23	Demonstrate proficiency in planning, constructing and using audio-visual materials in lessons.	IV	3.9155	1.9254
37	65	Devise and implement an evaluation plan for self-evaluation including use of student feedback.	IX	3.9429	1.8089
38	39	Utilize behavior modification techniques.	VI	4.0563	2.0416
39	30	Plan formal and informal assessment instruments or activities based on established objectives.	V	4.0986	1.4654
40	25	Extend the teaching-learning situation from the classroom to whatever relevant settings exist in the community.	IV	4.1972	1.8017
41	15	Diagnose student cognitive and affective difficulties and abilities based on analysis of formal and informal assessments.	II	4.2000	1.8463
42	24	Identify and utilize resources of the school and the community.	IV	4.2254	1.8454
43.5	26	Help students understand group processes such as group decision-making, leadership, peer relationships, and feedback.	IV	4.3239	1.9032
43.5	32	Write appropriate test items for measuring the mastery of specific objectives.	V	4.3239	1.8266
45.5	5	Explain and support his/her own philosophy of education.	I	4.4507	2.1300
45.5	20	Use pauses and/or appropriate wait-time in order to emphasize a point or encourage further discussion.	III	4.4507	1.6715
48	57	Collaborate and consult with other school personnel to facilitate a free flow of assistance for students.	VIII	4.4789	1.7309
49	6	Distinguish between the affective, psychomotor, and cognitive domains in identifying and writing objectives.	II	4.5211	1.7636
50.5	41	Establish and maintain a safe pattern of student movement and activity.	VI	4.5493	1.9331
50.5	45	Arrange instructional materials so that they will be maximally accessible.	VI	4.5493	1.7054

TABLE 3 (Cont.)

Ranking	Competency Number	Description of Competency	Category	Mean	Standard Deviation
52	31	Determine an appropriate mastery or criterion level for a test or other assessment instrument.	V	4.6857	1.7156
53	34	Devise and use adequate scoring systems for teacher-made assessment instruments.	V	4.7183	1.6317
54	58	Demonstrate an awareness of the specialities, skills, and services of other school and community personnel so that referral when needed is a viable possibility.	VIII	4.7887	1.6554
55	56	Speak to and work with parents and community groups that are interested in learning about a school's programs.	VIII	4.8551	2.0599
56	7	Write performance objectives in the affective and and cognitive domains at several levels of the taxonomy.	II	4.9577	1.8780
57	33	Administer and score teacher-made assessment instruments and standardized tests.	V	5.0714	1.9361
58	62	Demonstrate professional involvement through membership in professional organization, attendance at conferences, etc.	IX	5.0857	1.9615
59	48	Identify the legal rights and responsibilities of students and teachers.	VII	5.1690	1.7967
60	44	Maintain physical facilities and identify supplies and equipment necessary to support the program objectives.	VI	5.2113	1.4824
61	36	Conduct an item analysis on the results of an assessment instrument for the purpose of improving the items for later use.	V	5.5352	1.5291
62	50	Identify the legal consequences of invasion of privacy and use of physical punishment.	VII	5.5493	1.4421
63	46	Identify legal obligations of teachers to students.	VII	5.6338	1.7258
64	49	Demonstrate knowledge of contracts, negotiation, and legal relationships of teachers and board.	VII	5.8732	1.3515
65	2	Separate the classic or traditional philosophies of Plato, Aristotle and others from the contemporary educational philosophies of Dewey and other 20th century writers.	I	6.8169	0.7033

TABLE 4

FREQUENCY COUNT BY RANKING AND CATEGORY

	Category								
Rankings (1-65th)	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX
1-10	0	1	2	3	0	1	0	1	2
11-20	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	2
21-30	1	2	1	0	1	2	1	2	0
31-40	0	1	3	2	1	2	0	0	1
41-50	2	2	1	2	1	1	0	1	0
51-60	0	1	0	0	3	2	1	2	1
61-65	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0
TOTAL	5	10	7	7	7	9	5	9	6

TABLE 5

COMPETENCIES SIGNIFICANT AT .05 LEVEL

Competency Number and Description		Significance Level	Rank
8	Specify goals and aims for a unit and course that fit within the framework of the goals of the schools.	.016	31
9	Write a lesson plan which includes performance objectives, lesson introduction, lesson conclusion, activities, time sequence, materials, and evaluation.	.025	14.5
11	Pre-assess students for prerequisite skills or abilities necessary for the achievement of performance objectives.	.006	28.5
17	Provide verbal and non-verbal reinforcement for appropriate student response in a variety of ways.	.015	5
27	Accept values different from his/her own without value judgment.	.002	9
28	Demonstrate sensitivity to the feelings and concerns of students.	.004	3
36	Conduct an item analysis on the results of an assessment instrument for the purpose of improving the items for later use.	.029	61
38	Identify discipline problems and suggest methods of reducing or avoiding these discipline problems.	.011	4
39	Utilize behavior modification techniques.	.015	38
40	Provide alternative solutions to problems so that the consequence fits the misbehavior and neither teacher nor student lose face.	.009	26
54	Demonstrate the ability to serve as a facilitator or catalyst to promote student discussion and peer communication.	.007	20
65	Devise and implement an evaluation plan for self-evaluation including use of student feedback.	.027	37

TABLE 6

SCHEFFÉ PAIR-WISE

COMPARISONS FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

AMONG GROUPS

Competency	Interns	Elementary Teachers	Secondary Teachers	Faculty	Significant Difference
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$	
17	2.0741	3.4737	2.6250	2.5882	Interns: Elementary
27	2.1852	4.0000	4.2500	2.5294	Interns: Secondary Interns: Elementary
28	1.5556	2.0526	3.2500	1.5294	Interns: Secondary Secondary: Faculty
36	5.2963	5.7895	4.3750	6.1765	Secondary: Faculty
38	2.2963	2.0000	2.2500	3.7059	Elementary: Faculty
40	3.4815	2.7895	3.8750	4.7647	Elementary: Faculty
54	2.9630	4.5789	3.3750	2.7647	Interns: Elementary Elementary: Faculty

TABLE 7

SCHEFFÉ COMPARISONS OF AVERAGE RATINGS

FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG GROUPS

Competency	Intern	Elementary	Secondary	Faculty	Significant Difference
8	4.4444	3.8947	2.8750	2.8824	Interns: Faculty, Secondary, Elementary Interns and Elementary: Secondary and Faculty
9	4.0741	2.6842	2.2500	2.9412	Interns: Faculty, Elementary, Secondary Interns and Faculty: Secondary and Elementary
11	4.2222	3.7895	4.5000	2.3529	Faculty: Interns, Elementary, Secondary Interns and Secondary: Faculty and Elementary
27	2.1852	4.0000	4.2500	2.5294	Interns and Faculty: Elementary and Secondary
28	1.5556	2.0526	3.2500	1.5294	Interns and Faculty: Elementary and Secondary
36	5.2963	2.7894	4.3750	6.1765	Secondary: Interns, Faculty, Elementary
38	2.2963	2.0000	2.2500	3.7059	Interns and Faculty: Elementary and Secondary
39	3.6296	3.3158	5.2500	5.0000	Elementary: Interns, Secondary, Faculty Interns and Elementary: Faculty and Secondary
40	3.4815	2.7895	3.8750	4.7647	Elementary: Interns, Faculty, Secondary Faculty: Interns, Secondary, Elementary
54	2.9630	4.5789	3.3750	2.7647	Interns and Faculty: Secondary and Elementary
65	3.8846	4.8947	3.0000	3.4118	Elementary: Interns, Secondary, Faculty